UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

LARRY THOMAS KEISTER,) CASE NO. 5:06 CV 1424
Petitioner,) JUDGE PATRICIA A. GAUGHAN
v.) MEMORANDIM OF ORTHON
MICHELE EBERLIN,) <u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION</u>) <u>AND ORDER</u>
Respondent.)

On June 9, 2006, petitioner <u>pro se</u> Larry Thomas Keister filed the above-captioned petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Keister is incarcerated in an Ohio correctional institution, having been convicted of statutory rape (2 counts), pursuant to a guilty plea, in April 2003. For the reasons stated below, the petition is denied and this action is dismissed.

A federal court may entertain a habeas petition filed by a person in state custody only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a). In addition, petitioner must have exhausted all available state remedies. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b).

As grounds for relief, petitioner asserts that his concurrent 10 year sentences violate the principles set forth in United States v. Booker, 543 U.S. 220 (2005) and Blakely v.

Case: 5:06-cv-01424-PAG Doc #: 2 Filed: 08/11/06 2 of 2. PageID #: 43

<u>Washington</u>, 542 U.S. 296 (2004). He further appears to claim that the court should find "cause and prejudice" for his decision not to appeal the denial of a delayed postconviction motion he filed in the Ohio Court of Common Pleas, wherein he sought to raise this issue.

Without the regard to the merits of Keister's assertions, it is evident on the face of the petition that he has yet to appeal his sentence, an avenue still available to him under Ohio Appellate Rule 5. His petition is thus premature.

Accordingly, pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, the petition is denied and this case is dismissed without prejudice. The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith, and that there is no basis on which to issue a certificate of appealability. Fed.R.App.P. 22(b); 28 U.S.C. § 2253.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Patricia A. Gaughan
PATRICIA A. GAUGHAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE